

MEETING SUMMARY	CINCINNATI MUNICIPAL AIRPORT-LUNKEN AIRPORT CTAG#4 January 20, 2004	
Meeting called by: City of Cincinnati Meeting summary prepared by Cheri Rekow		
Attendees:		
<div><div><div>1. Barbara Seitis</div><div>2. Steve Crow, ATCT</div><div>3. Patrick Kelly, Cin. Fire Dept.</div><div>4. Jim Miller, Cin. Fire Dept.</div><div>5. Mike Lacinak, Mt. Washington Community Council</div><div>6. John Frank, Cincinnati Board of Realtors</div><div>7. Judy Zehren, Lunken Noise Council</div><div>8. Jenny Kaminer</div><div>9. Reginald Victor, City of Cincinnati</div><div>10. Tom Ewing, Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce</div><div>11. Kathy Tyler, Midwest Jet/FBO</div><div>12. Bill Posey, FBO Rep.</div><div>13. Steve Fagel, City Law Department</div><div>14. Tom Edwards, Flight Depot</div><div>15. Andrew Betts, Sierra Club</div><div>16. Paul Berge, PBE</div><div>17. David Ross, California Community Council</div><div>18. Doug Adams, Mariemount</div><div>19. Rocky Merz, Council Member Crowley’s Office</div><div>20. Peter Bruemmer, AOPA</div><div>21. Harold Blocher II, City of Highland Heights</div></div><div><div>22. Tom Grote</div><div>23. Bryan Snyder, Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission</div><div>24. Bill Ohl, FAA-CVG</div><div>25. Deborah Conrad, KCAB-CVG</div><div>26. Forest Haygood, Cin. Fire Dept.</div><div>27. Samuel Britton, Madisonville Community Council</div><div>28. David Rattenbury, LAAVC/CFTC</div><div>29. Joseph Bagby</div><div>30. Albert Peter, Anderson Township Trustee/LAOAB</div><div>31. Susan Halzapfel, Indian Hill/LAOAB</div><div>32. Bob Bibb, Linwood</div><div>33. Anson Turley, Cin. Fire Dept</div><div>34. Krissi Barr, Business Community</div><div>35. Mike Brenner, DOT&E Aviation Division</div><div>36. Will Brown, Mt. Lookout Civic Club</div><div>37. Scot Conover, Columbia Tusculum Community Council</div><div>38. Dan Dickten, Lunken Airport Administrator, DOT&E</div><div>39. Eileen Enabnit, Director, DOT&E</div><div>40. Don Rosemeyer, City Engineer, DOT&E</div><div>41. Cheri Rekow, Aviation Division, DOT&E</div></div></div>		
Agenda Topic	Presenter(s)	Discussion
Greeting & Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none">City staffConsulting staffCTAG and CTAG/AC members	Eileen Enabnit, Director, DOT&E Don Rosemeyer, City Engineer, DOT&E Cheri Rekow, Sr. City Planner, DOT&E, Aviation Division	
Review of CTAG Meeting #3 <ul style="list-style-type: none">Meeting SummaryReview of Questions & Answers	Eileen Enabnit, Director, DOT&E ACES Cheri Rekow, Sr. City Planner, DOT&E, Aviation Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Consultants and staff will continue to take suggestions throughout the alternatives phase of the process (Please refer to targeted dates)All comments received will be responded to either at meetings or in the meeting summariesIn response to comments received, weight-bearing considerations was included as a topic on the agenda.

Aviation Operation Forecast

The Federal Aviation Authority (FAA) requires development of a forecast as a requirement of the master planning process. They also establish the methodology and must approve the forecast numbers.

- The forecast IS:
 - Only a projection of future traffic for planning purposes.
 - A figure that represents about 1 to 2 percent annual growth for the 5-, 10-, and 20-year planning periods. The forecast for 2022 is approximately 18 percent less than the actual operations at Lunken Airport in the mid-1970s.
- The forecast IS NOT:
 - A goal or a target or reality. Improvements will only be implemented when adequate real growth is achieved and the City elects to pursue the recommended capital improvements.
 - Intended to be aggressive or understated, but rather to accurately reflect a best professional prediction of aviation trends and tenants' stated plans.
 - Constrained by specific local restrictions such as weather conditions, topographic features, and policy direction. In reality these and others are limitations.

Facility Requirements

- Facility requirements are structures and infrastructure that would be needed to support the forecast. Requirements are NOT a goal or a target or reality. To accommodate all of the potential improvements to meet the needs of the forecast would require approximately 50 acres of land. The 50-acre requirement may be able to be accommodated on existing airport property.
- Land is a limited resource, therefore, it is especially critical that future improvements are carefully considered and planned.
- The City does not have an obligation to seek funding and construct these facilities.
- Requirements are also based on "critical aircraft". There are two design aircraft that the consultant is considering at this time—the Gulfstream 5 series and the Boeing BBJ. These are both business/corporate planes that are consistent with the use of Lunken as a corporate/general aviation facility. To operate these routinely and safely at Lunken, a runway lengthening and an increase in the published weight-bearing capacity would be needed.
- The Gulfstream 5 series is more likely to meet the level of service needed to be a critical design aircraft, especially in the next 10 years. We already have a tenant who is purchasing one of these.
- While we cannot control what airplanes land at the airport

		<p>if the aviation facilities are adequate, we can control what facilities are built, both aviation and non-aviation. For example, there are no facilities to support a cargo operation. There are no warehouses, sorting facilities, or vehicular pavement to accommodate trucks, good highway access, or anything else that would support this type of an operation. The City has the ability to control what type of facilities would be built.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are two areas of consideration with the runway weight bearing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The published weight-bearing capacity—currently 70,000 pounds ○ Strengthening the runways, taxiways, and apron pavements to accommodate frequent usage by heavier aircraft without unreasonable deterioration or a measurable shortened life span
Working Session: Mission, Goals and Objectives	Cheri Rekow, DOT&E Aviation Division (facilitator)	<p><u>Comments Provided by CTAG and CTAG/AC</u></p> <p>General Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Model set of Goals and Objectives from the Ohio DOT Aviation Division will serve as starting point. Task of working session is to tailor to needs of the Lunken Airport community, and be concise • Avoid subjective words • Be specific in the Mission Statement (i.e. best, safest vs. maximize or minimize. • Consider using phrases such as “strike a balance between...” as opposed to “maximizing or minimizing” to avoid development of conflicting goals. • Avoid goals and objectives that are too specific and as such might be misinterpreted in the future. <p>Mission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More emphasis on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Corporate and General Aviation without precluding small regional commuter service ○ Maintaining self sufficiency (revenue generating) • Incorporate additional concepts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Maximize economic benefit to region ○ Capitalize on unique setting ○ Actively address quality of life issues including impact to environment and surrounding neighborhoods/municipalities <p>Goal 1 (Physical facilities)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be consistent with the Mission concepts discussed. • Carefully define terms such as Commuter. Note: small regional commuters and “micro-jets” (6-8 seats), per current Part 139, may be desirable. Large carriers are not.

		<p>Goal 2 (Safe Airport)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add “secure” to “safe and reliable” • Add statement to address security issues • Renumber #1 <p>Goal 3 (Environmental Impacts)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address noise specifically • Consider combining Goal #1 and #3 • Emphasize balance between positive and adverse affects as opposed to minimizing or maximizing... • Replace “environmental interest groups” with specific types of organizations • Place more emphasis on solving environmental problems rather than “working with” advocates • Establish performance standards or measures (Staff Note: this should be a separate document, not part of the Master Plan Update.) <p>Goal 4 (Adapting to Changing Aviation Industry)</p> <p>Goal 5 (Economics)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify term “commercial”. (Do not want to endorse large air carriers.) <p>Goal 6 (Land Use)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condense sample objectives • Need to be more realistic or elaborate on goal to balance land use and zoning measures with operational measures to promote future compatible development • Don’t preclude desired airport land acquisition to accommodate growth or buffer • Consider merging Goal 6 with 7 <p>Goal 7 (Development, consistent with plans)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balance economic growth with protection of neighboring property value <p>Goal 8 (Public Participation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider itemizing “local planning organizations to include neighborhood councils, and municipalities • Recognize authorities and advisory boards (i.e. LAOAB, LAAUC) without naming them so as not to be dated if organizations change. <p>Consider adding Goal (9) to address Recreation Amenities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See comments co-submitted by Mike Burns and Mike Lacinak. <p>Miscellaneous:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide references to FAA Regulations
--	--	---

Additional Written and Submitted Working Session Comments/Suggestion:

1. Mission:

Insert “environmental- and neighborhood-friendly to safe, efficient aviation facilities.

Consider merging Goal 6 with 7.

Follow “ To provide quality services for all airport customers” with “while also protecting the quality of life in the surrounding neighborhoods.”

Elaborate on “To maintain and develop the airport in an environmentally sound manner” by adding, “... respecting its unique setting within recreation, scenic river, nature preserve, and residential areas, and recognizing its role ...” as a vital part of the ...economy and multi-modal transportation network.

2. Mission: ... Bill had an excellent point when he talked about measurable goals... my archetypal Mission Statement is “Before this decade is out we will land a man on the moon and return him safely to earth”. This has Vision, Action, Deadline and a constraint all in less than a line, but the idea is so compelling.... I offer for consideration: “Improve Lunken Airport so that by 2008 it has become, and thereafter remains, the corporate airport of choice in the tristate”. We don’t want to cede our business to HAO or CVG, yet both are investing heavily and have their attractions.

3. Goal 1: Replace “Develop” with “Analyze the capability of the “ airport’s physical facilities...

4. Goal 3, Objective #1 recommended language: “Strive to maintain the environment and the ecological balance of the surrounding areas within existing environmental laws, rules and regulations to minimize potential environmental impacts on the natural environment and neighboring communities

5. Goal 3: I am in favor of written commitment to environmental compliance, as was suggested by (Cheri)— the discussion was noncommittal and some members did not see the need for it. For one, compliance is much preferable to chasing enforcement!

6. Goal 4: Shouldn’t it be the role of the communities to adapt to the demands of aviation or should aviation adapt to the airport, which communities believe balance service to aviation with protection of the neighborhoods?

7. Goal 6 should be kept if there is a Land Use Chapter later in the document. Despite the lack of CTAG interest in this goal, I think they would agree that we don’t want to promote or encourage residential development of areas in the Immediate Vicinity of the airport. Change Goal to include uses “in the immediate vicinity of the airport”. Also, promote development that is consistent with airport land use and development objectives.

8. Add Goal 9: “Develop the airport in a manner that respects its setting within recreation and residential
Objectives:

Protect acreage devoted to recreational usage including golf, tennis, playgrounds, athletic playfields and bike paths

Develop the airport in a manner that enhances the developing Armledder park and recreation facilities

Implement recommendations to mitigate noise from the Part 150 Study

Foster positive relationships between Lunken Airport Oversight Advisory Board and airport sponsors to insure the compatibility of the airport with its residential neighbors.

9. Goal 8, Objective #2: Add “community councils” to “local governments, the state, the county, local planning organizations, the FAA”...

10. Goal 7 Add Objective #3: “Develop the airport in a manner which preserves and protects neighboring residential property values.”

Weight Bearing	Guest Speaker: Andrew Bodoci, H.C. Nutting	<p>Conclusions:</p> <p>The existing analysis of the runway pavement completed by H.C. Nutting will be used in conjunction with the new forecasts to establish new recommendations for the pavement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The runway extension is not designed and we have not analyzed what the options are. Based on input from the CTAG, the consultants will be looking at the options of extending all in one direction or the other or splitting any extension between the two directions. We will be bringing the alternatives before the CTAG to look at and comment on the implications of extending in any direction. We do not know at this time what the actual potential impact of lengthening the runway will be.
<p>Next Steps:</p> <p>Forecast Approval</p> <p>Economic Impact Study Update</p> <p>CTAG Meeting #5:</p> <p>Alternatives Analysis</p> <p>Target Dates</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forecast will be submitted to FAA in mid-February. If you have any concerns please give them to Cheri by end of the week. Staff is reviewing variables used in the 1998 Economic Impact. If no significant changes are found, then the study will be relevant. Otherwise, an update may be needed. Consultants will be back to present Alternative Airport Layout Plans at CTAG Meeting #5 in February. CTAG members prefer 4:00 meeting time. Other important upcoming dates are February 9, City Council Community Development Committee Hearing to be held at Lunken Airport (EJM on Airport Road) at 3:00 PM. All are welcome to attend and hear a presentation about Lunken Airport Details about a Public Workshop to be scheduled in March will be forthcoming
Next Meeting		<p>February 17, 2004</p> <p>4:00 PM</p> <p>Location:</p> <p>H.C. Nutting, 611 Lunken Park Drive</p>